FILED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DEC 3 1 2018

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy Courts for the District of Columbia

MOHSEN KHOSHMOOD,)
Plaintiff,))
V.) Civil Action No. 1:18-cv-02871(UNA)
EXPERIAN,	
Defendant.)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case because the complaint fails to meet the minimal pleading requirements of Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Pro se litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Jarrell v. Tisch, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987). Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires complaints to contain "(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction [and] (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a); see Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009); Ciralsky v. CIA, 355 F.3d 661, 668-71 (D.C. Cir. 2004). The Rule 8 standard ensures that defendants receive fair notice of the claim being asserted so that they can prepare a responsive answer and an adequate defense and determine whether the doctrine of res judicata applies. Brown v. Califano, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

Plaintiff sues Experian, alleging that in November 2018, he was improperly overcharged by \$85 for credit-monitoring services, however, but does not articulate a legal claim against

defendant. He goes on to allege unspecified discrimination by unnamed management companies

and to generally contest the concept of credit-checking in the rental application process. The relief

sought is not entirely clear; plaintiff mentions [sic] "government spending # \$trillion To remove

the extremism from society under health care . . ." and states that [sic] "Last 12 month from

years . . ."

As drafted, the complaint fails to meet the minimum pleading standard set forth in Rule

8(a). It fails to set forth a basis for this Court's jurisdiction and the actual claims and requests for

relief against defendant are entirely clear. Therefore, this case will be dismissed. A separate Order

accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: December 31, 2018

2